

UDC: 811.163.42(091)
DOI: 10.30970/sls.2025.74.5003

BARTOLOMEO KASIĆ'S ORTHOGRAPHIC GUIDES FOR WRITING IN LATIN SCRIPT

Ivana KRESNIK

*Faculty of Croatian Studies University of Zagreb
Borongajska cesta, 83d, Zagreb, 10000 (Croatia)
Department of Croatology
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9815-2816
e-mail: ikresnik@fhs.unizg.hr*

Croatian grammarian, spiritual writer, and translator Bartolomeo Kasić published brief orthographic guides (4 to 5 pages) in four publications he prepared for print and published between 1613 and 1617 and again in 1633; in them, he explained how to phonetically articulate and read the combinations of letters in these books. The first orthographic guides published from 1613 to 1617 are actually the same text with slight modifications in certain expressions. The orthographic guide from 1633 was thoroughly reformulated and some orthographic forms were changed. Kasić's fundamental orthographic principles are univocity and the intent for one letter to always represent the same phonetic articulation. While he did achieve a high degree of univocity, Kasić was unable to overcome the southern Croatian tradition of writing certain phonemes with combinations of letters as in the Italian orthographic tradition. He pondered issues of language and orthography his entire life, records of which he left in his autobiography; the orthographic guides analysed in this paper show his development and dilemmas surrounding this topic.

Keywords: Bartolomeo Kasić; Navk za dobro pijsatti Slovinski; orthography; Croatian language, Society of Jesus.

Introduction

¹Bartolomeo Kasić was a Croatian Jesuit known to the philological community as the author of the first Croatian grammar and the "father of Croatian linguistics".²His number of publications and manuscripts make him the most prolific Croatian writer and translator of the 17th century. After writing the grammar—an accomplishment from his younger days—he endeavoured to provide his compatriots with all of the most important works necessary for spiritual growth translated into the local language. Even during his lifetime, he was listed in the catalogue of Jesuit writers as one who "wrote for the benefit of his homeland".³ Kasić had

¹Bartolomeo Kasić was born on the island of Pag on 15 August 1575. At the age of fifteen, he went to the seminary in Loreto, then to the Roman seminary in 1593; finally, he was admitted to the Jesuit novitiate in Rome on 14 August 1595 (Horvat, 2004, 21-24). He died in Rome on 28 December 1650. The main historical source on Kasić is his autobiography, in which he describes his life until the age of 50 (Kasić, 2006). It is common to call him Bartol Kašić, although he signed himself Bartolomeo Kassicch, which suggests that his name was Bartolomeo Kasić (cf. Kresnik & Sesatak, 2025, 449).

²This paper was presented in the Croatian language on 23 May 2025 under the title *Slovopisni naputci Bartolomea Kasića* at the XXXII International Slavic Colloquium (Lviv, 22-23 May 2025). The paper was written on the occasion of the 450th anniversary of the birth of Bartolomeo Kasić.

³"Scripsit hactenus bono suæ patriæ" (Alegambe, 1643, 56).

the trust of Superior General Mutio Vitelleschi,⁴ with whom he corresponded during his service away from Rome; he wrote to him of the challenges he encountered, sought advice, and suggested changes (Kasić, 2006). In matters of the faithfulness of translation and spiritual works into Croatian, both the Society of Jesus in Rome and the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith relied on Kasić's work.

The writing of grammars and dictionaries was a common task for Jesuits preparing for missionary work. Kasić composed his grammar of the Croatian language for the needs of a Croatian language seminar, which he taught along with Alexander Komulović at the Roman College for Jesuits from the Croatian lands and surrounding regions. Although the grammar was his last linguistic work, he remained occupied with linguistic issues his entire life, providing solutions and opinions on the Croatian language and its dialects in his other publications and manuscripts. A separate brief chapter addresses the issues of the orthography of the four editions Kasić published between 1613 and 1617 and in 1633: *Nacin od meditationi i molitvæ* (1613); *Zarčalo dvhovno od pocetka, i sfarhe xivota coviečanskoga* (1614, ²1621); *Piesni duhovnæ od pohvalaa Boxyieh* (1617); *Navk karstyanski kratak* (²1633).

The goal of this paper is to analyse the orthographic guides in the aforementioned publications with a view to the relationship between their phonological and orthographic descriptions, as well as to provide insight into Kasić's developmental path as regards issues of language and orthography, and how these issues are reflected in the texts.

1. Publications in which Kasić published orthographic guidelines

In four publications, the first editions of which he prepared between 1613 and 1617,⁵ Kasić published brief orthographic instructions explaining how to read (and write) letters and letter combinations for palatal consonants, as well as for non-palatal consonants affected by graphemic solutions for palatal consonants. These publications are the following

1. *Nacin od meditationi i molitvæ* (1613), Kasić's translation of Ignatius of Loyola's Spiritual Exercises. The orthographic instructions are published towards the end of the book, entitled *Navk za dobrò pifjatti Slovinski, i lafnò proctitti ovò Libarçe* ("A guide to writing Croatian well and easily reading this book") (Kasić, 1613, 108–111). It consists of eight numbered sections, each of which addresses a specific orthographic topic of greater or lesser breadth.⁶

2. *Zarčalo dvhovno od pocetka, i sfarhe xivota coviečanskoga* (1614, ²1621) is a translation of Angelo Elli's 1606 *Specchio spirituale del principio, et fine della vita humana* made by Mavar Orbin, a Benedictine friar from Dubrovnik. Kasić prepared this book for print, as well as writing a preface and including an orthographic guide. The guide appears near the end of the book in the first and second edition under the title *Navk za dobrò pifjatti Slovinski, i lafnò proctitti ovò Libarçe* (Orbin, 1614, unpag. 329–332; Orbin, 1621, unpag.

© Kresnik., 2025

⁴ Mutio Vitelleschi (*1563–†1645), the sixth Superior General of the Society of Jesus as of 15 November 1615. Kasić's success in releasing his prepared publications began when Vitelleschi assumed his position. However, during the last decade of Vitelleschi's life, Kasić struggled to publish; for some, he did not succeed in receiving an imprimatur. Even before this, he often complained in his letters to Vitelleschi from Dubrovnik that many people in Rome were creating obstacles for him (Kasić, 2006).

⁵ Kasić succeeded in releasing numerous publications in 1617; aside from his translation of the psalms (Kasić, 1617) and Bellarmine's Catechism, his book *Istoria Loretana*—which contains no orthographic guide—was also published.

⁶ Vladimir Horvat (2016, 272–274) transliterated this work into Croatian Latin script.

329–333).⁷ The guide is not included in the third edition (³1703). Significant differences in the ¹1614 edition as compared to the first guide (Kasić, 1613) are as follows: 1) "pò Nauku" is included at the end of the sentence; 2) "pofozni" has been replaced with "ofsóbiti"; 3) the style of the first sentence has been changed somewhat, while "sdruxena" has been replaced with "fadrúxena" in the second; 4) a brief part of the explanation has been left out of the first sentence, and a new sentence has been added at the end; 5) certain expressions have been changed and better examples included; of lexical significance, "yere" has been replaced with "premdà" and "onàda" with "tadà"; 6) a small change in an example; 7) small changes in examples; 8) the word "potribbæ" has been changed to "potrebbæ" and a long description has been added at the end. The text has thus been revised and refined as compared to the previous edition.

3. *Pjesni duhovnæ od pohvalaa Boxyieh* (1617) is Kasić's translation of the first fifty psalms, which he dedicated to his mother. The orthographic instructions are printed at the beginning of the book under the same title as before: *Navk zà dobrò pijsfati Slovinski, i lafnò proctitti ovò Libarçe* (Kasić, 1617, unpag. 13–16). The text is the same as in the previous edition (Orbin, 1614); small differences may have been the result of typographical errors.

4. *Navk karstyanski kratak* (*1617,⁸ ²1633) is Kasić's translation of Roberto Bellarmine's popular catechism *Dottrina cristiana breve*. No copy of the first edition from 1617 has been found; it is mentioned only as a bibliographic entry. Only one copy of the second, 1633 edition is known (unavailable to this author); the transcription of this copy into modern Croatian orthography (Štefanić, 1940) has been used for this paper. The orthographic guide in the second edition differs significantly from the previous ones; it is entitled *Scitocu zà lafcgne profctitti ovaka pijsfma* ("For the reader to more easily read these letters"), and is located at the beginning of the book (pp. 10–14) (Štefanić, 1940, p. 41). Here, the guide has been completely revised: the title has been changed; it has twelve sections (instead of eight), each describing specific orthographic topics; the terms *bukvica* and *babica* are no longer used; the list of syllables has been omitted; the examples have been changed.

2. The content of Kasić's orthographic guidelines from 1613, 1614, and 1617

2.1. Bukvica

Kasić's orthographic guide begins with a *bukvica*, meaning 'an ordered series of letters', lat. *alphabet*: "BVKVIČA. A, a. B, be. C, ce. Ç, çe. D, de. E, e. F, fe. G, ga. H, ha. I, i. K, ka. L, la. M, ma. N, na. O, o. P, pa. Q, qva. R, ra. S, s, fa. T, ta. V, u. V, va. X, xa. Y, ya. Z, za." (Kasić, 1613; 1617; Orbin, 1614; 1621).

The oldest attestation of the word *bukvica* with this meaning in the Croatian language is from Marin Držić in the mid-16th century: "E, nauči me i bukvicu" (cf. Štefanić, 1976, 35). The following attestations of the word are from Kasić's orthographic guide; it is also found in Mikalja, who was influenced by the Dubrovnik cultural circle: "dafciča za uciti bukviču, [...] *Tavoletta del A, B, C, D, Tabella Abecedaria*" (Mikalja, 1649, p. 58). There are multiple attestations in Ardelio Della Bella: "Abecedario. *Abecedarium, ij, n. Bùkviza, ze. f. Chiuriliza, ze. f.*" (Della Bella, 1726, 10); "Alfabetico d'alfabeto. *Alphabeticus, ca, cum. Bukvicni, cna, cno. Od Bukvize. Od Chiurilize. Alfabeto sostaot. Alphabetum, ti. n. g. Bùkviza, ze. f. Chiuriliza, ze. Slòva, vaa. n. pl.*" (Della Bella, 1726, p. 60). We must also

⁷Horvat (2016, 274–275) precisely compares the 1621 orthographic guide to the translation of Ignatius' Spiritual Exercises (Kasić, 1613) as the first edition of Orbin's translation (1614) was not available to him.

⁸No copy of the first edition from 1617 has been found; it is mentioned only as a bibliographic entry.

mention an attestation from another resident of Dubrovnik, Ignacije Đorđić: “od evrijske bukvice aliti alfabetu” (Đorđić, 1729, p. 405).

Vjekoslav Štefanić provided an overview of the use of the word *bukvica* from the 16th to 18th century (Štefanić, 1976, pp. 34–36), showing that *bukvica* was the term for Glagolitic script in the broader Dalmatian region, as opposed to *ćirilica* for Cyrillic script. The usage of writers from Dubrovnik (Držić, Orbin, Đorđić) and those influenced by Dubrovnik (Kasić, Mikalja, Della Bella) indicates that the term *bukvica* in Dubrovnik's cultural circle had the more general meaning of the alphabetical list of letters of any graphemic system.⁹

The orthographic guide in the second edition of Kasić's translation of Bellarmine's catechism has been revised significantly, no longer mentioning *bukvica*, although it does provide an alphabetical list of capital and lowercase letters (Štefanić, 1941, pp. 41, 47–48).

2.2. "Each letter has its own sound"

Kasić's second paragraph includes only one sentence: "Each letter has its own distinct sound before and after each other letter" (Kasić, 1613; 1617; Orbin, 1614; 1621). In later text, Kasić refutes this claim himself, attempting to explain the pairs of letters he uses to record certain palatals. This is an important statement, however, as it shows his aspiration towards a principle that has dominated Slavic literacy since its Christian beginnings. The principle Kasić states here was present in the Slavic Glagolitic and Cyrillic scripts; however, in his time, it was nowhere near being achieved in Latin script for the Croatian language.

The orthography Kasić used made a serious attempt at this principle; his explanations attempted to eliminate combinations of letters that were unnecessary in Croatian. He attempts to explain this unobtrusively in multiple places, e.g.: "It is unnecessary to append the letter H [to the letter G] in any word (*Bogga, Boggu, drugge, druggi, druggo, dugge*) since we do not have this need as do the Italians, although this may be done to please those who have learned to read and write in the Italian manner, so as not to confuse the reader (Kasić, 1613; 1617; Orbin, 1614; 1621). The fact that this is a principle he strived towards and not one he necessarily realised successfully is apparent in attestations in the text itself, where Kasić does include H after G when it follows E or I: “Drugħæ”, “dughimi” (Kasić, 1613, p. 9).

Kasić's second paragraph contains another important piece of information: Kasić differentiates between the concept of letter and sound. This is important as, among older writers, the principle of one letter representing one sound often results in a lack of distinction between the concept of letter and sound. Differentiating between the concept of sound and phoneme is an even more recent development (20th century), so it is understandable for Kasić not to have understood this difference in his meta-language.

The principle of “one letter for one sound” stems from the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition, which was present in Kasić's time as living Glagolitic reality. Later, Kasić abandoned this principle to adhere to another Croatian Latin-script orthographic principle: the principle of unambiguous letter representation, which requires that every letter representation (regardless of how many letters it contains) can be unambiguously interpreted as a single sound.

In his translation of Bellarmine's catechism, Kasić reformulates the second paragraph of his guide to a certain extent. Now, he states that each letter for a consonant must represent a

⁹There are no attestations of the word *bukvica* among the northwestern Croatian lexicographers. Juraj Habelić and Andrija Jambrešić did not explain the lat. *alphabetum*. Bilostinac does not include the word *bukvica* when explaining lat. *alphabetum*: “Stobe, ili postub. knyifcize vřzakoga jezika” (Bilostinac, 1740, p. 71). This is interesting because, when composing his general Croatian encyclopaedic dictionary, Bilostinac also used Mikalja's dictionary.

single consonant before letters for vowels and consonants, as well as after them, if it requires special articulation (Štefanić, 1941, p. 47). Kasić thus did not abandon the principle of one letter for one sound, although his change in this explanation expresses it somewhat unclearly.

2.3. Babica

The third paragraph is dedicated to simple syllables, which Kasić refers to as *bukvica*. This is a list of vowels combined with consonants: “Ba, be, bi, bo, bu. Ab, eb, ib, ob, ub. [...] Za, ze, zi, zo, zu. Az, ez, iz, oz, uz.” (Kasić, 1613). This list has the same name in Orbin (1614; 1621) and in the translation of the psalms (Kasić, 1617), but not in the second edition of Bellarmine's catechism (Štefanić, 1941, pp. 41, 47–48). These are also the only known attestations of the word *babica* in this meaning, leading to the conclusion that this was an expression specific to Kasić, which he abandoned by 1633.

Kasić's *babica* is derived from the tradition of the *početnica*, instructional guides used to teach children to write. The list of syllables is based on the interpretation that vowels have an articulatory duration (adj. *glasovit*), while consonants do not (adj. *neglasovit*). The articulation of consonants is thus dependent on vowels, thus implying that the writing of consonants should be tied to the writing of vowels.

As Kasić's *babica* is tied to the concept of sound and syllable, it was decided to research how other Croatian lexicographers of the time approached the terminology of consonants and the relationship between vowels and consonants. For example, Mikalja has a comprehensive list of meanings of the word *glas* (Mikalja, 1649, pp. 106–107); however, he does not attest the word *babica*, nor do the other aforementioned Croatian lexicographers.

2.4. Letters C, Ć, and K for [č], [c], and [k]

In the fourth paragraph, after claiming that the letters C, Ć, G, H, K, S, V, X, Y, Z signify only one sound before and after every vowel, Kasić focuses on the letters C, Ć, K. He explains the principle of the usage of these three letters for the sounds [č],¹⁰ [c]¹¹, and [k] in Croatian writing according to the Italian orthographic tradition, which the southern Croatian cultural circle used in Kasić's time. The letter C is assigned the singular phonetic value [č], the letter Ć is assigned the singular phonetic value [c], and the letter K is assigned the singular phonetic value [k]. While this certainly resolved the issue of the writing of the sounds [č], [c], and [k], it did not exclude the letter C from letter combinations for other sounds: CH for [č];¹² SC and IC for [š].¹³

2.5. The letter G in writing the sounds [g], [ɟ], and [ŋ]

In the fifth paragraph, Kasić explains the usage of the letter G, foreseeing that this letter can be used to write the sounds [g], [ɟ]¹⁴, and [ŋ];¹⁵ however, he foresees no solution for the sound [ð].

The first part pertaining to the writing of the sound [g] is significantly changed in the orthographic guide from 1614. The first states that when a vowel follows the consonant [g], it is sufficient to write only G without the accompanying letter h instead of GH as in the Italian tradition, listing examples such as: “Bogga, Boggu, drugge, druggi, druggo, dugge”

¹⁰ IPA [t͡ʃ], hereinafter: [č].

¹¹ IPA [t͡s], hereinafter: [c].

¹² IPA [t͡ʃe], hereinafter: [č].

¹³ IPA [ʃ], hereinafter: [š].

¹⁴ IPA [ɟ], hereinafter: [ɟ].

¹⁵ IPA [ŋ], hereinafter: [ŋ].

(Kasić, 1613). However, this solution was not implemented in the publication, where the typical attestations appear: N pl. f. “Drugħæ” [druge], and pl. n. “dugghimi” [drugimi] (Kasić, 1613, p. 9). He adds that writers may accommodate to those who write H so as not to confuse them (Kasić, 1613). Kasić was thus able to define how the sound [g] was written only if he excluded the existence of the sound [ǰ]; this is applicable to his 1613 edition, as he was not yet heavily influenced by the Dubrovnik cultural circle, and other sounds were foreseen for places where the sound [ǰ] may have appeared: G pl. n. “Evangelya” (Kasić, 1613, p. 20); N sg. m. “Anyeo” (Kasić, 1613, p. 20); D sg. m. “Anyelu” (Kasić, 1613, p. 21).

In the second edition—the translation by Mavar Orbin—Kasić changed the guide, having noted that his idea could not be implemented in texts containing notation for the sound [ǰ]. Thus, at the beginning of the instruction on the letter G, he includes that the letter H is to be added before I and E in the Italian manner, including a list of examples: “Bogga, Boggu, drugghe, drugghi, duggo, dugghe”, while also including a note that this is unnecessary (Kasić, 1614). This is also the first situation in which we see that Kasić had to accommodate and change his linguistic and orthographic practices, and that he was unable to unilaterally define a linguistic and orthographic solution. Additionally, this indirectly indicates that the reflex of the proto-Slavic cluster *jd, the adoption of Latin and Italian loan words containing the letter G, and the related presence or absence of the sound [ǰ] were current linguistic and orthographic issues in the 17th century. In 1613, Kasić did not consider the sound [ǰ] a general feature of the Croatian language requiring a written representation. During his later Dubrovnik period, he accommodated to the dialect of Dubrovnik, although his autobiography, written in his later years, does contain a complaint about people from Dubrovnik lobbying in Rome regarding linguistic issues on the Croatian side of the Adriatic.

Further on in this paragraph, he discusses the writing of GLI for [li] and [l], GHLI for [gli], GN for [n], and GHN for [gn] (Kasić, 1613, 1617; Orbin, 1614, 1621).

The description of the letter G does not support Kasić's theory from the second paragraph that each letter represents one sound.

2.6. The letters s, r, x, z always denote the same sound.

In the sixth paragraph, Kasić notes that the letters s, r, x, z always denote the same sound—s, r for [s], x for [ʒ], and z for [z]. This had to be emphasised due to the different articulations of these letters in the Latin and Italian orthographic traditions.

2.7. Writing the sounds [č] and [š]

Although Kasić's orthography achieved a high degree of univocity in its letter representations, the solution for the sound [č] stands out as a weak point in the system. He was certainly aware of this, as is apparent in that his description made use of syllables (*babica*) to explain CCHI, CHIA, CHIE, CHIO, CHIU for [či], [ča], [če], [čo], [ču], and ACCH, ECCH, ICCH, OCCH, UCCH for [ač], [eč], [ič], [oč], [uč]. Regarding the sound [č], Kasić did not have room to implement any reform or simplification, as the Croatian cultural space (from Slavonia and central Croatia to Dalmatia) already had a strong tradition of using the letters CH to denote the sound [č].¹⁶ Not only was the notation for the sound [č] rather complicated, the notation for the articulation of [či] was not fully univocal.

¹⁶ The northwestern Croatian orthographic tradition does not differentiate between [č] and [či]; in places where they are expected, CH is used. There was debate about this in the 17th and 18th centuries, likely caused by the fact that clergy from all regions came to Zagreb, which was the centre of northwestern Croatian literacy, even from those regions where [č] and [či] were well differentiated and where CH was tied to the articulation of [č].

By writing the sound [š] with the letters ꞛ, he attained complete univocity. Although it may seem this could conflict with other solutions using the letters ꞛ or s, while transcribing Kasić's text, no situations were identified in which it would be unclear how to interpret the letter pair ꞛ or which one would have to rely on linguistic intuition to interpret it.

2.8. Letters V and Y

Interpreting the letters V and U in the Croatian orthographic tradition is often challenging due to the Croatian language's dialectal diversity, which includes the duality of [v/u]; this makes some written records impossible to interpret with certainty, especially in hybrid texts with mixed dialectal features. This issue is worsened by the ambiguity of the letter V in the European Latin script tradition, as it can denote both a vowel and a consonant. Kasić's explanation makes it clear that his letter V is a consonant [v], graphemically denoted as a lowercase cursive *v*. This is a clear, univocal usage. Kasić's need to dedicate an explanation to this arises from the aforementioned European Latin script tradition, in which the letter V can denote both the sound [v] and [u].

Kasić's usage of the letter Y for the sound [j] is also fully univocal. His explanation for the letter Y was certainly included only due to the general European orthographic tradition, which usage he deviates from. The issue of the sound [j] in relation to the phoneme /j/ and the related letter J is still a pressing issue in the modern Croatian standard language, which is burdened with a modern orthographic norm. Kasić resolves this issue elegantly and properly from a linguistic viewpoint: he uses the letter Y only to denote those places in which the phoneme /j/ appears: "ya", "korifniyi", etc. In doing so, Kasić came close to the concept of the phoneme. All other articulations in which the sound [j] (or one similar to it) appears as a side-effect of other phonetic factors are not denoted with a letter. Kasić also expresses an awareness that the sound [j], which he denotes with the letter Y, is sometimes pronounced more "sharply" and sometimes less "sharply". Kasić also uses the lowercase letter j, however this is an exclusively prosodic marker for the length of the preceding vowel; he does not comment on this in his orthographic guide.

3. Orthographic guide in Kasić's 1633 translation of Bellarmine's Catechism

The orthographic guide in Kasić's 1633 translation of Bellarmine's Catechism is completely revised (Štefanić, 1941). As no copies of the 1617 edition of this translation have been found, we do not know if the guide was also changed in the first edition. However, this is unlikely, especially as the 1633 guide includes linguistic and orthographic knowledge and discoveries Kasić came to in the period preceding the publishing of the 1633 edition.

This new guide has 12 paragraphs, but it is no longer than the previous ones. The content is distributed differently, and the orthographic and linguistic elements emphasised are somewhat different. Kasić abandons the terms *bukvica* and *babica*, and he does not provide the list of syllables previously found in the *babica*. He affirms that the Croatian language is written using 25 Latin script letters, divided into consonants (adj. *neglasovit*) and vowels (adj. *glasovit*).

The third paragraph is dedicated to letter combinations that deviate most significantly from the idea that one letter denotes one sound—these are the combinations of letters for the sounds [ć], [l], and [ń] and the series of sounds [gl] and [gn], for which he simply states that they are to be used in the Italian manner; without additional explanations, he provides lists of Croatian words in which these situations appear. It is quite apparent that this explanation is much more concise, less transparent, and less skilful than in the orthographic guides described above.

In the fourth paragraph, more space is given to an explanation of the pair SC for the sound [š]; again, this is surprising as this letter combination is univocal and causes no confusion in usage, not conflicting with other letter pairs that might lead to misinterpretation.

The fifth paragraph is the most surprising; in it, he includes the letter combination YH in places with the reflex of the Proto-Slavic *jd in the examples “méyha, preyha, priyhe, priyhi, nayhoh, preyhu”, noting that this letter combination is not read as two separate letters but as a whole (Štefanić, 1941, p. 47). Thus, if Y is not read as [j] nor H as [h] in place of the Proto-Slavic *dj but rather as a whole, in the Croatian linguistic area, this can only be the sound [ǫ]. Kasić first employed this orthographic solution in his 1631 edition of *Zarčalo navkka karstyanskoga*, in which he introduced the combination YH in places one would expect the sound [ǫ]: present 2 sg. “náyhefs” (p. 7); present 2 sg. “dóyhefs” (p. 7); adj. A sg. f. “túyhu” (pp. 19, 20); present 3 sg. “dóyhe” (p. 31); L pl. f. “mayhiah” (p. 35); present 3 sg. “póyhe” (p. 50); adv. comparative “rieyhe” (p. 151), etc (Kasić, 1631). As previously stated, Kasić's first orthographic guide (1613) did not foresee a graphemic solution for [ǫ] as it was unnecessary; in the orthographic guide for Orbin's translation, he replaced the part relating to the pairs GE and GI by allowing them to be interpreted as [ǫ]. However, this interpretation is possible without ambiguity only in two cases: the conjunction “takoger” (p. 99), and the imperative 2 sg. “Priygi” (unpag.) (Orbin, 1614). On the basis of this orthographic change introduced to Kasić's 1631 edition, it may be concluded that the 1633 orthographic guide was newly written by Kasić, and that the orthographic guide in the lost first 1617 edition of Bellarmine's Catechism was the same as the others from the period, with eight numbered paragraphs.

The sixth paragraph explains that the letter C is always used for the sound [č], the seventh that letter Ć is for the sound [c], and the eighth that letter Z is for the sound [z]. In all three explanations, he relies on pronunciation in Latin and Italian. In the ninth paragraph, he explains that the letter s or r is pronounced “thinly”; in the tenth, he returns to Y, which he claims denotes a consonant. In the eleventh paragraph, he explains that the letter X denotes a sound similar to rG, and thus tries to additionally evoke the sound [ʒ]. The reference to Latin and Italian pronunciation and the presentation of pronunciations as “thin” or similar to another pair of letters give the impression that Kasić in 1633 did not expect the readers of his book and orthographic guide to be skilled in the Croatian language, although he did expect them to understand Latin and Italian pronunciation and orthography. In the twelfth paragraph, he concludes that he provided the orthographic guide so that anyone could read his book.

Conclusion

This paper describes and explains the orthographic guides Bartolomeo Kasić included in four of his publications released from 1613 to 1617 and in 1633. The orthographic and linguistic challenges he faced are the same as those Croatian linguists and writers of all periods faced until the 20th century; some of these problems are yet to be resolved satisfactorily. Kasić distinguishes between letters and sounds, and provides the principle that each letter denotes one sound. However, this remained only an aspiration, as it was not the case in practice—certain sounds in the Croatian language had to be denoted with more than one letter, making univocity difficult to attain.

Kasić succeeded in attaining this univocity in all linguistic situations except in denoting the sound [ǫ]. His first orthographic guide from 1613 did not foresee an orthographic solution for the sound [ǫ], which he partly and inconsistently corrected in his second guide in 1614. His solution was to accept the Italian orthographic practice for this problem. He only found

a solution in 1631 in the letter pair YH for [ð]; he included this solution, which he implemented in his publications for the rest of his life, in his final orthographic guide in the second edition of his translation of Bellarmine's Catechism in 1633. For this edition, Kasić composed an entirely new orthographic guide; it thus follows that the orthographic guide for the (lost) first edition from 1617 was the same as for *Piesni duhovnæ* from this same year.

When writing the orthographic guide, Kasić did not take into account only the Croatian language; he also references the Latin and Italian Latin script orthographic traditions, on which he relies heavily in his explanations. The solutions he offers are often better and more linguistically informative than those we have today for writing the modern Croatian language. He endeavoured to resolve the challenges he faced for the spiritual and general good of his people.

Bibliography

Alegambe, Philippe, 1643. *Bibliotheca scriptorum Societatis Iesu*. Antverpiae: Apud Ioannem Meursium.

Bilostinac, Ivan, 1742. *Gazophylacium seu Latino-Illyricorum onomatum ærarium*. Zagrabiae: Joannis Baptistæ Weitz.

Della Bella, Ardelio, 1728. *Dizionario italiano, latino, illyrico*. In Venezia: Cristoforo Zanne.

Horvat, Vladimir, 2004. *Bartol Kašić – otac hrvatskoga jezikoslovlja*. Zagreb: Sveučilište u Zagrebu.

Horvat, Vladimir, 2016. Kašićeve pravopisne upute. *Diacovensia*, 24(2), pp. 267–279.

IPA. (1999). *Handbook of the International Phonetic Association*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Kasić, Bartolomeo, 1613. *Nacin od meditationi i molitvæ [...] pò Poctovanomu Oçù Bartolomeu Kaffichiu*. V Rimv: Polak Bartolomea Zanetta.

Kasić, Bartolomeo, 1617. *Piesni duhovnæ od pohvalaa Boxyieh sloxi dalmatinski Bartolomeo Kassicch*. V Rimv: Pri Bartolomeu Zannettu.

Kasić, Bartolomeo, 1631. *Zarçalo navkka karstyanskoga*. In Roma: S. Congreg. de Propag. Fide.

Kasić, Bartolomeo, 2006. *Autobiografija isusovca Bartola Kašića u prijevodu i izvorniku*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

Kresnik, Ivana; Šestak, Ivan, 2025. Katalozi Družbe Isusove u 17. stoljeću o hrvatskim isusovcima piscima: Povodom 450. obljetnice rođenja Bartolomea Kasića. *Obnovljeni Život*, 80(4), pp. 441–459. [“Catalogues of the Society of Jesus in the 17th century about Croatian Jesuit writers: On the occasion of the 450th anniversary of Bartolomeo Kasić's birth”]

Mikalja, Jakov, 1649. *Blago jezika slovinskoga illi Slovník u komu izgovarajufe rjeci slovinske Latinski, i Diacki*. Lauretii: Apud Paulum & Io: Seraphinum.

Orbin, Mavar, 1614. *Zarçalo dvhovno od pocetka, i sfarhe xivota coviecanškoga*. U Rimu: Polak Bartolomea Zanetta.

Orbin, Mavar, 1617. *Zarçalo dvhovno od pocetka, i sfarhe xivota coviecanškoga*. In Venetia: Presso Marco Ginami.

Štefanić, Vjekoslav, 1940. Bellarmino-Kašićev ‘Nauk krstjanski kratak’ po izdanju od g. 1633. *Vrela i prinosi*, 12, 38–68.

Štefanić, Vjekoslav, 1976. Nazivi glagoljskog pisma. *Slovo*, 25–26, 17–76.

BARTOLOMEO KASIĆ'S ORTHOGRAPHIC GUIDES FOR WRITING IN LATIN SCRIPT

Ivana KRESNIK

*Faculty of Croatian Studies University of Zagreb
Borongajska cesta, 83d, Zagreb, 10000 (Croatia)
Department of Croatology
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9815-2816
e-mail: ikresnik@fhs.unizg.hr*

Croatian grammarian, spiritual writer, and translator Bartolomeo Kasić published brief orthographic guides (4 to 5 pages) in four publications he prepared for print and published between 1613 and 1617 and again in 1633; in them, he explained how to phonetically articulate and read the combinations of letters in these books. The first orthographic guides published from 1613 to 1617 are actually the same text with slight modifications in certain expressions. The orthographic guide from 1633 was thoroughly reformulated and some orthographic forms were changed. Kasić's fundamental orthographic principles are univocity and the intent for one letter to always represent the same phonetic articulation. While he did achieve a high degree of univocity, Kasić was unable to overcome the southern Croatian tradition of writing certain phonemes with combinations of letters as in the Italian orthographic tradition. He pondered issues of language and orthography his entire life, records of which he left in his autobiography; the orthographic guides analysed in this paper show his development and dilemmas surrounding this topic.

Keywords: Bartolomeo Kasić; Navk za dobro pijsatti Slovinski; orthography; Croatian language, Society of Jesus.

Стаття надійшла до редколегії 24.06.25.
Прийнята до друку 20.09.25.
Опублікована 10.12.25.